DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 221 CS 204 049

AUTHOR Knudson, Jerry W.
TITLE Herbert L. Matthews and the Cuban Story. Journalism Monographs No. 54.
INSTITUTION Association for Education in Journalism.
PUB DATE Feb 78
NOTE 33p.
AVAILABLE FROM Prof. Harold Wilson, AEJ Publications Manager, School of Journalism, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 ($2.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Bias; Expository Writing; Foreign Countries; Historical Reviews; *Journalism; *New Journalism; *Newspapers; *News Reporting; *News Writing
IDENTIFIERS Cuba; *Matthews (Herbert L)

ABSTRACT

Herbert L. Matthews, a veteran journalist for the "New York Times," traveled to Cuba in 1957 to interview Fidel Castro, then a revolutionary seeking the overthrow of the Batista regime. This monograph considers the impact of Matthews' newspaper articles about those interviews and of his subsequent articles about the Cuban situation and develops a discussion of objective news reporting, news bias, and a reporter's personal involvement in the news that he or she reports. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED153221

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JERRY W. KNUDSON

Herbert L. Matthews and the Cuban Story

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Association for Education in Journalism

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

(Copyright 1978 by the Association for Education in Journalism)

JERRY W. KNUDSON is associate professor of journalism in the School of Communications and Theater, Temple University. This study was first presented as a paper to the Latin American Studies Association meeting in Atlanta, Georgia, March 26, 1976.

CS200649

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS

NUMBER FIFTY-FOUR • FEBRUARY 1978

BRUCE H. WESTLEY, *Editor*

EDITORIAL BOARD

THOMAS A. BOWERS, JAMES W. CAREY, STEVEN H. CHAFFEE, DAVID G. CLARK, PETER CLARKE, RICHARD R. COLE, EVERETTE E. DENNIS, S. WATSON DUNN, RICHARD A. EK, RONALD T. FARRAR, BRADLEY S. GREENBERG, JAMES E. GRUNIG, THOMAS H. GUBACK, WILLIAM A. HACHTEN, HANNO HARDT, KURT E. M. KENT, LAWRENCE W. LICHTY, L. JOHN MARTIN, MAXWELL E. McCOMBS, JACK M. McLEOD, JOHN T. McNELLY, DON R. PREMBER, MICHAEL J. PETRICK, GALEN RARICK, KEITH P. SANDERS, T. JOSEPH SCANLON, LAWRENCE SCHNEIDER, DONALD L. SHAW, JOHN D. STEVENS, VERNON A. STONE, DWIGHT L. TEETER, PHILLIP TICHENOR, DAVID H. WEAVER, MARY ANN P. YODELIS.

Members of the AEJ Publications Committee: JOHN D. STEVENS (*Chairman*), MAXWELL E. McCOMBS, WILLIAM L. RIVERS, EDWIN EMERY, VERNE EDWARDS, GARTH JOWETT.

Published serially at Lexington, Kentucky, by the Association for Education in Journalism with the support of the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism.

Manuscripts and other editorial correspondence should be addressed to the editor, Prof. Bruce H. Westley, School of Journalism, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, 40506. Business correspondence, including subscriptions, should be directed to AEJ Publications Manager, School of Journalism, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

Subscription rates: $10.00 per year, $10.50 outside the United States and Canada. Checks should be made out to Journalism Monographs.

COMMUNICATIONS

To the Editor:

In 1963, Wayne Danielson wrote, "Coder reliability tests are extremely important and should never be neglected unless the codes being used are so obvious that even a severe critic will concede that 'on the face of it' they can be reliably used." ("Content Analysis in Communication Research," in Ralph O. Nafziger and David M. White, eds., *Introduction to Mass Communications Research*, p. 189.) He further went on to predict, "Reputable journals are gradually becoming reluctant to print analyses in which coder reliabilities have not been tested." (*Ibid.*)

This is why it is sad to see that, as the editor of *Journalism Monographs*, you are still accepting content analysis studies for publication in 1977 which do *not* report coder reliability tests. We are referring to No. 50, "The Press and Authority: Portrayals of a Coach and a Mayor," by David L. Paletz and Dennis LaFiura. (We could criticize many other aspects of this study as well, but will restrict this letter to the subject of coder reliability testing.)

Footnote 15 is incredible: "The usual methods of ensuring coding reliability were followed and to conserve space will not be detailed here." In the first place, there *are* no "usual methods" of checking coder reliability. A survey of the content analysis studies published in Vol. 53 of *Journalism Quarterly* will show you:

* some reported inter-coder reliability only, while others reported both inter-coder and intra-coder reliability
* some used two reliability coders, some used three, and one used six or more
* some specified the level of analysis at which the reliability checking was done, while others did not
* some check-coded a sample of the content, some check-coded 100% of the content, and one check-coded the practice material only
* Etc.

Now which of these "usual methods" did Paletz and LaFiura use?

In the second place, Paletz and LaFiura cannot use the one loophole which Danielson provides: ". . . unless the codes being used are so *obvious* that even a severe critic will concede that 'on the face of it' they can be reliably used." Consider some of the things that Paletz and LaFiura claim to have measured:

* "roles" (p. 8)
* "symbolic dimensions" (p. 9)
* "implicitly or explicitly critical" (p. 10)
* "strategic functions" (p. 10)
* "enhanced . . . authority" (p. 11)
* "tended to reinforce the ceremonial and depersonalization aspects in the process of his symbolization" (p. 12)

These categories are definitely *not* obvious, and therefore require empirical *evidence* of coder reliability.

In the third place, space was *not* the reason for omitting this important information. There are almost four blank pages at the end of *Journalism Monographs* No. 50.

What steps do you think we can take, individually and collectively, to improve the reporting of communication research methods and results in the future?

Sincerely,

Dennis T. Lowry
Assistant Professor

Christopher H. Sterling
Associate Professor

John B. Roberts
Professor

Thomas F. Gordon
Associate Professor

John A. Lent
Professor

John M. Kittross
Professor

Temple University
Nov. 10, 1977

The Senior Author Replies:

Dear Professor Westley:

As you may recall, the original manuscript was many times longer than the version printed. Indeed, at the editor's behest, it was slashed not once but thrice.

Thus, as stated, lack of space was indeed the reason for omitting coder reliability data. As for the "almost four blank pages," their appearance is no doubt a function of the exigencies of printing; we knew nothing of them.

Miffed at the accusation of bad faith and the intemperate tone of the letter, we nonetheless acknowledge the validity of the complaint. Coder reliability data are important in any study involving content analysis. Space should have been found for ours.

Sincerely yours,

David L. Paletz
Duke University
Jan. 6, 1978

The Editor Replies:

Length is often a problem. This one came in at 150 ms. pages, was returned for surgery and came back at 59 pages, then went to referees. They asked for

greater emphasis on "press" rather than "authority," urged further trimming—and asked for better detail on reliability. The senior author complied on the first two points, cut the ms. to 42 pages and eliminated all 17 tables.

The hard decision—taken by the editor alone—was whether to publish a summary with no quantitative data, include some tables while trimming out much good material, or use up far too much precious page budget. The first course was reluctantly chosen, and it made no sense to give explicit detail on reliability in a report that did not present data.

Most readers would understand that the senior author would gladly supply both the tables and a basis for judging the reliability of measures. Perhaps this should have been stated. B.H.W.

Feb. 11, 1978

There was an answer to our desperate cries for help. Only one: yours.

– *Mrs. María B. Amezaga, Matanzas, Cuba, to Herbert L. Matthews, January 1959.*

Clausewitz wrote of the fog of war; there is also a fog of history through which we journalists grope our way as best we can. At least we are in the midst of what is happening.

– *Herbert L. Matthews, lecture, City College of New York, March 15, 1961.*

MORE THAN two decades have passed since Herbert L. Matthews of the New York *Times* made his historic trek into the Sierra Maestra to interview Fidel Castro on February 17, 1957. With that journey Matthews proved to the world that the hero of the attack on the Moncada barracks on July 26, 1953, was alive and well and still pursuing his revolutionary calling with zest.[1]

In those two decades, much has changed. Cuba has been transformed socially if not economically, with political advances and setbacks. Castro has held on to power for 18 years now, longer than any other Latin American *caudillo* committed to radical social change. Indeed, the most remarkable thing about Castro is his ability to survive. He and his Revolution have survived an invasion launched by the United States in April, 1961, the role of pawn in a nuclear chess game between the United States and the Soviet Union in October, 1962, a 14-year economic blockade imposed by the Organization of American States, failure to export the Revolution to other countries of Latin America and, by latest count, eight assassination attempts by the Central Intelligence Agency.[2]

In the midst of this, Herbert L. Matthews retired from the *Times* in 1967 and lived in Australia until his death ten years later. Earlier Matthews had returned to the *Times* Editorial Board until his retirement. He published three major books and several pamphlets and articles defending his early coverage of Cuba and

commenting upon the course of the Cuban Revolution after several more trips to the island.[3] A newspaperman who worked for the *Times* for 45 years, he covered the Italian invasion of Abyssinia with an enthusiasm that later was to cause him pain,[4] the Republican side during almost the whole course of the Spanish Civil War, the Allied invasion of Sicily and the entire Italian campaign. But it was his coverage of the Cuban Revolution that, toward the end of his career on the *Times*, was to cause him the most anguish of all. Although he walked out of his office on the tenth floor of the Times Building for the last time on September 10, 1967, carrying no grudges—perhaps some bitterness but no remorse—he had every reason to believe that he had done an honest job as a newspaperman and that his work would stand the test of time.[5]

Matthews was aware that he would be judged harshly in the years immediately after the Cuban Revolution came to power on January 1, 1959. On March 31, 1961, eight months before Castro's "I am a Marxist-Leninist" speech, Matthews wrote in a memorandum to *Times* editors:

> My now famous criticism of the American press to the effect that in my nearly 40 years in journalism, I have never seen a big story so badly handled, is based on the fact that the American press has been very biased. This goes just as much for the pro-Fidel elements like Professor C. Wright Mills and the Fair Play for Cuba Committee as it does for the vast body of the American press which has been intensely hostile and emotional. . . . I believe I mentioned last year that it will take a long time for American public opinion to come around to a proper understanding of what happened in Cuba, at which time I have no doubt of the judgment on whatever I have written. As I recall I suggested this might take about 50 years, at which time I will be 110 years old.[6]

Matthews was right in forecasting stormy times ahead. After repeated Cuban exile picket lines denounced him in front of the Times Building as late as 1964, after an alleged exile plot to kill him brought FBI protection, after receiving a massive volume of hate mail, after a bomb scare prevented him from concluding a speech at the University of New Mexico, after being dropped from the board of directors of the Inter American Press Association and almost being censured by that organization, and after being shunned at the Overseas Press Club, Matthews lived to savor a change in U.S. policy and—to a lesser extent—public opinion. He

lived to witness Senator George McGovern's journey to Havana in 1975 as the first step toward including Cuba in the spirit of *détente*. Matthews also saw the groundwork being laid for an understanding of the rights over territorial waters between the two nations and—perhaps more importantly—the impetus toward re-establishing diplomatic relations by setting up information sections in both capitals. Matthews, who also lived to observe Cuban intervention in Africa, significantly subtitled his last work, *Revolution in Cuba* (1975), "An Essay in Understanding."[7]

It is impossible in this brief paper to review in detail all of Matthews' work on Cuba. Some tentative evaluations are offered, but primarily this study is concerned with the impact of the original interview series in 1957 and subsequent articles through mid-1960, by which time the Marxist-Leninist alignment of Cuba was becoming clear. It examines the role of a journalist in the events he witnesses and reports. Can it or should it be one of complete detachment? Is he, as the New Journalism seems to say, an inevitable participant in the news process, and his participation should be honestly faced and his reactions honestly recorded? Herbert Matthews made his position clear quite early in this debate over objectivity in the journalism profession. In *The Education of a Correspondent*, published in 1946, he declared:

> True journalism, like true historiography, is not mere chronology, not (to cite Von Ranke's famous definition of the purpose of history) "simply to describe the event exactly as it happened," but placing the event in its proper category *as a moral act and judging it as such.*[8]

Again, in *The Yoke and the Arrows*, a book-length account of Franco's Spain published in 1961, Matthews stated quite candidly:

> I would never dream of hiding my own bias or denying it. I did not do so during the Spanish Civil War and I do not do so now. In my credo, as I said before, the journalist is not one who must be free of bias or opinions or feelings. Such a newspaperman would be a pitiful specimen, to be despised rather than admired. There is only one test that means anything, only one quality that the reader has a right to demand—the truth as the man sees it and all the truth. He must never change or suppress that truth; he must never present as the truth anything that he does not honestly believe to be true.[9]

What truth did Matthews find in the Sierra Maestra in 1957? In the first place, he was no Stanley looking for a Dr. Livingstone: that is, he was not engaged in a journalistic lark or performing a

journalistic stunt. Since 1949, Matthews had been a member of the Editorial Board of the New York *Times* specializing in Latin American affairs. In 1952 he covered the opening phase of the Bolivian National Revolution with such empathy that he was decorated by the Bolivian revolutionary government in 1959. The *Times* printed his editorials opposing such dictators—in the decade which Tad Szulc of the *Times* prematurely called *Twilight of the Tyrants*—as Juan Domingo Perón of Argentina, overthrown in 1955; Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua, 1956; Gustavo Rojas Pinilla of Colombia, 1957, and Marcos Pérez Jiménez of Venezuela, 1958.[10]

Thus, Matthews had wide-ranging knowledge of Latin American realities, but it was only after Castro's re-entry into Cuba with the 82-man *Granma* expedition on December 2, 1956, that Matthews became keenly interested in the fate of Fulgencio Batista, who had dominated Cuban politics for a quarter of a century, either behind the scenes or after grabbing power before the scheduled elections of 1952. Francis L. McCarthy, head of the United Press bureau in Havana, reported that Castro had been killed in the *Granma* landing, and a few days later sent another dispatch describing the place where he was buried. Over the protests of Mrs. Ruby Hart Phillips, the *Times'* resident correspondent in Cuba, the *Times* front-paged the original UP story of Castro's death. As Mrs. Phillips recalled later, "Apparently McCarthy's information came from an officer in the Cuban air force, who had taken part in the air attack on the Castro expedition and who was enthusiastic about the accuracy of his bombing."[11]

Actually, only a handful of men, including Fidel, Raúl Castro and Ernesto Ché Guevara, had made it into the Sierra Maestra, but no one in the outside world and only a few Cubans knew this until the first of a three-part series of Matthews' interview with Castro appeared on the front page of the *Times* on February 24, 1957. That is, for almost three months there was total silence from Fidel, a remarkable achievement in itself. With typical bravado, he had radioed ahead from Mexico his invasion plans, hoping to arouse popular support, but also signalling Batista authorities to be on the watch for him. Fidel Castro was not a major figure in the world press at that time. He was a troublesome nuisance whom Batista believed to be dead and some Cubans feared was dead. The

incident seemed to be closed, in the view of many, with one more idealistic and hot-headed young Cuban rebel cut down at the age of 29. It was all part of the passing scene.

Then a remarkable thing happened, which demonstrates the enormous power of the New York *Times*—when it chooses to use it—and why the Western press calls itself the Fourth Estate. Matthews scored the Latin American journalistic *coup* of the century in resurrecting Fidel Castro. Not exactly modest, the *Times* correspondent devoted about half of his first installment to the dangers involved in getting into and out of the Sierra Maestra, which was ringed with Batista's troops. Matthews later published a fuller account of how he got the scoop.[12] But, since the Matthews Papers have become available at the Columbia University Library, these have been relied upon to piece together this account, adding details not previously published. Original sources from almost everyone concerned are available, for Matthews later asked the participants to write their firsthand accounts. That was done after former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba Arthur Gardner, an admirer and friend of Batista, apparently had testified falsely before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on August 27, 1960, that he had arranged the trip into the Sierra Maestra on condition that Matthews would share any information gleaned with the U.S. Embassy staff in Havana.[13]

What actually happened? As Mrs. Phillips, who had been covering Cuban affairs for the *Times* since 1931,[14] reconstructed events, René Rodríguez—one of the survivors of the *Granma* landing—came to Havana from the Sierra Maestra in late January, 1957. His mission was to inform Faustino Pérez, acting chief of the 26th of July Movement in the capital, that Castro wanted to be interviewed by a foreign correspondent to prove he was still alive. Javier Pazos, a Havana University student active in the movement, was designated to make the arrangements. He conferred with his father Felipe Pazos, former head of the National Bank of Cuba and another active supporter of Castro's cause. As Javier explained later, "In part, the reason for wanting a foreign correspondent was due to Batista's press censorship, but it also reflected the resentment and general dislike that we all shared towards the almost totally corrupt national press."[15] The only foreign correspondent that the elder Pazos knew was Ruby Hart

Phillips, and so he turned to her. His account of what followed, although laced with Cuban humor, reveals the atmosphere of fear that pervaded Batista's Cuba:

> I phoned Ruby Phillips . . . and asked her to receive me. So she did in her house-office, where there were three or four more people and a relatively heavy traffic of persons entering and leaving—boys from the grocery and the drugstore, maids, friends, etc. At my request for a private talk, she took me to an adjoining room without any door to separate it from the hall, where the other people were, five yards apart at most. I told her in a whisper that Fidel Castro wanted a foreign correspondent to visit him at the Sierra and she answered in a loud and most penetrating voice, that could be heard one block away—"So, you have contact with Fidel Castro! I cannot believe it! Please, tell me all you know." I cannot recall any occasion in my whole life, neither before nor afterwards, when I had a [so] ardent desire to kill someone.

Mrs. Phillips, incredulous, insisted on talking with René Rodríguez, the Castro emissary, herself. Pazos recalled, "At this point I should have ended the conversation and started to look for some other correspondent, but it was not prudent to quarrell [sic] with Mrs. Phillips at this stage and so I promised her to arrange a meeting with the man from the mountains." The meeting took place one or two days later in Pazos' office in the Bacardí Building. On that occasion, he remembered, "Ruby asked everything on heaven and earth (this time in a very low voice of conspirational [sic] tones, in spite that all doors and windows were closed and the room sound conditioned). . . ."[16]

Mrs. Phillips recalled, "They told me frankly a woman would be too conspicious [sic], especially an American, and asked if I could send someone. . . . As I walked back to [my] office a few blocks away I met Ted Scott of NBC. He came back with me and I told him the whole story since we were good friends and I trusted him. . . . I asked Ted if he were interested and he said no for the same reason I had, that he would have to leave Cuba. Then Ted suggested that we get you [Matthews] to do [it]."[17]

Edward W. Scott, the NBC reporter who also wrote a column for the Havana *Post*, picks up the story:

> In my presence, Ruby sat down at the typewriter and wired Emmanuel Freedman, Foreign Editor of The New York Times, suggesting that you should come to Havana immediately. She showed me the cable and I felt that it was properly worded. Of course, it did not make any suggestion as to the reason why Ruby wanted you to come to Havana.[18]

Within a few days Matthews and his wife Nancie arrived in Havana; he had planned a Cuban trip anyway to check out persistent rumors that Castro was alive. After an interview with the elder Pazos, a party of five set out in a jeep for Manzanillo, the jumping-off place in Oriente Province. They included Matthews and his wife, posing as middle-aged American tourists or, if they were caught with the money the others were taking to Castro, as a businessman and his wife interested in buying land in the easternmost provice of Cuba where the Sierra Maestra is located. They were accompanied by Faustino Pérez, hunted by the police because he headed the July 26th Movement in Havana, known to Matthews only as "Luis," and Liliam Mesa, known only as "Marta," to protect their identities, and Javier Pazos, who was peeved at the presence of Liliam Mesa, a Havana society girl, because, as he wrote later to Matthews, "I didn't want you to take the impression that it was a country fair. . . ."[19]

After driving the 500-mile length of the island overnight, Matthews got a few hours rest at the home of Manzanillo schoolteachers Pedro and Ena Saumell, where Mrs. Matthews was to stay overnight while the rendezvous with Castro took place. The dangers and doubts of the arduous journey, partly by jeep and then on foot, into the Sierra Maestra for the actual interview with Castro need not be recounted here. With the flair of a Richard Harding Davis, Matthews provided the exciting details that took up almost one-half of the first installment on February 24, 1957, which occupied almost a full page of the *Times* after the story was continued from the front page. On the way back to New York, the seven small pages of Matthews' notes, bearing Castro's signature to authenticate them, had gone through Cuban customs tucked inside Mrs. Matthews' girdle. The newspaperman began writing his story aboard the plane, but the first installment was held up for a week so it could be promoted for the Sunday edition of February 24, 1957.[20]

When the interview with Castro did appear in print, it was by any standards a journalistic bombshell. As with any human enterprise, it contained errors—some later acknowledged by Matthews and others not. The best-known miscalculation was the size of the rebel band in the Sierra Maestra: Castro told Matthews that Batista had 3,000 men in the field against them, deployed in columns of

200, against "[us] in groups of ten to forty." There was another reference to 50 telescopic rifles which the insurgents had, whereas—as Fidel later boasted at the Overseas Press Club when he visited the United States in April, 1959—at the time of the Matthews interview Castro had only 18 armed men.[21]

In the original story, Matthews also stated, "The reports reaching Havana that frequent clashes were taking place and that the Government troops were losing heavily proved true." This was clearly an exaggeration at that time. Matthews also erred in reporting that the Cuban Communist Party, *Partido Socialista Popular* (PSP), "naturally bolsters all the opposition (to Batista) elements." This was not true. The PSP had dismissed Castro as a petty bourgeois reformer—a judgment based upon his "History Will Absolve Me" speech of 1953—and later refused to heed his call for a general strike on April 8, 1958, perhaps fearing by that time he would steal their thunder.[22]

What about Castro himself? Noting his "extraordinary eloquence," Matthews wrote:

> The personality of the man is overpowering. It was easy to see that his men adored him and also to see why he has caught the imagination of the youth of Cuba all over the island. Here was an educated, dedicated fanatic, a man of ideals, of courage and of remarkable qualities of leadership. . . . [O]ne got a feeling that he is now invincible. Perhaps he isn't, but that is the faith he inspires in his followers.[23]

Those who maintain that the *Times* "created" Castro should consult the installment of February 25 in which Matthews wrote, "The dictator [Batista] has lost the young generation of Cuba. The group of young rebels, led by former law student Fidel Castro, that dominates the Sierra Maestra at the eastern end of the island and that is fighting off successfully the cream of General Batista's army *is only one element*—the most dramatic one—to prove this" (stress added). And in the final installment of February 26, Matthews wrote that the directorate of the Federation of University Students "are fighting a parallel, separate fight for the same goals." He concluded the series with this paragraph:

> So one sees three elements lining up against President Batista today—the youth of Cuba, led by the fighting rebel, Fidel Castro, who are against the President to a man, a civic resistance formed of respected political, business and professional groups, and an honest patriotic component of the Army, which is ashamed of the actions of the Government generals. Together these

elements form the hope of Cuba and the threat to General Fulgencio Batista.[24]

It was, however, the first story of February 24, 1957, which caused a splash so big it amazed Matthews himself.[25] There was such a demand for that Sunday edition of the *Times* among Batista exiles in Miami that copies were black-marketed for $1.50 each.[26] According to Robert Taber, a CBS documentary maker, "Before the day was out, the Cuban underground [in Miami] was busily producing photostatic copies for distribution in Cuba, and was working on a translation."[27] Since censorship of incoming as well as outgoing news was in effect in Cuba, Matthews' stories were literally cut out of the February 24 and 25 editions which reached Havana. The effort seemed useless, however, as Raoul Alfonso Gonsé, director of *El Mundo* of Havana, wrote Matthews on February 25 that his story "has been a sensation in Cuba." Gonsé noted that he had received a summary of the last installment by cable "and moreover, I have obtained a smuggled copy of it."[28]

Perhaps because Batista officials believed the story to be a fake and hoped to discredit the *Times*, censorship was lifted before the end of the state of siege and the February 26 edition arrived intact. As Richard G. Cushing, an official of the United States Information Service in Havana and a news source for Matthews, wrote on February 26, "Now that the censorship is off (as of today) reproduction of the articles is a certainty in the local press."[29] To Ted Scott of NBC, Cushing wrote, "Herb Matthews may qualify for the Pulitzer Prize for his Castro scoop. I understand the Cuban government is issuing a flat denial . . .—an odd procedure considering the prestige of the paper and of the writer."[30]

The interview was vigorously denounced by Edmund Chester, a former CBS executive who worked as public relations counselor for the Batista regime. Believing that Castro was dead and the story a fake, Chester issued a stout denial through Santiago Verdeja, Minister of National Defense, calling the story "a chapter in a fantastic novel." The *Times* published the text of this denial on February 28, along with a reply by Matthews and a photograph (retouched because of the poor light) showing him interviewing Castro.[31]

Meanwhile, Batista refugees staged a demonstration in support of Matthews in front of the *Times* building, and messages of congratulations poured into his office. As Matthews wrote to Turner Catledge, the *Times'* chief news executive, "I never in my thirty-five years on the Times have received such a flood of letters and telegrams as I have had this time."[32] Ted Scott of NBC News called Matthews' account of the interview "the summit story of an exciting career." Scott also joked, "For the nonce [Feb. 28, 1957], your aristocratic name is a stench in official nostrils at the 23rd Parallel, but the Opposition is proposing constitutional reforms so that you can be elected President."[33] Edward W. Barrett, dean of the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, noted, "It was wonderful to see the old firehorse in operation again."[34] And Alberto Gainza Paz, owner of *La Prensa* of Buenos Aires, called Matthews' journalistic feat "the outstanding story of the year."[35]

Matthews perhaps winced—or smiled—at some of the praise, such as that by John A. Brogan, Jr., of King Features Syndicate, who wrote that the scoop "reminds me of the good old Hearstian accomplishments." Brogan also referred to Matthews' "catastrophic achievement" when he apparently meant "cataclysmic."[36] And in an inter-office memorandum, Harrison E. Salisbury called Matthews' attention to "a small and rather grudging bouquet" that had appeared in Moscow's *Literary Gazette.* In a one-third column report headed, "Useful Trip," the Soviet publication falsely charged that Matthews had been writing editorials in New York supporting American puppets such as Batista. The story continued:

> [Then] Matthews left his writing desk and went on a trip to Cuba. Matthews travelled all over the country and even went to the mountains of the Sierra Madre [sic] where a group of rebels headed by the former student Fidelio [sic] is active. Matthews wrote about the bitter terror saddled on Cuba by Dictator Batista.[37]

If any Cuban official still doubted the authenticity of Matthews' story, the doubts were laid to rest when Robert Taber and Wendell Hoffman of CBS made their way into the Sierra Maestra in April to do a documentary shown on U.S. television on May 19, 1957. *Bohemia*, the popular Cuban weekly review, stated:

The film documentary of the Columbia Broadcasting System terminated a chapter in the record of developments in the Sierra Maestra. After that sensational report, lively testimony to the rebel presence in the mountains, it was known for certain that hostilities would break [out], putting an end to long weeks of doubt and rumors.[38]

Matthews returned to Cuba to interview Batista on June 5, 1957. There he was allowed to submit only written questions to the Cuban dictator. In a reply, probably drafted by Chester, Batista dismissed Castro as a criminal and reproached the *Times* correspondent:

There is [now] no censorship in Cuba, Mr. Matthews, and you know very well that my government has never interfered with you in your work as a journalist in Cuba—even though you associated with known criminals and pleaded the cause of a man who has taken up arms in an effort to overthrow the constituted government. You have always had at least as much freedom in Cuba as you have had in your own country, despite the fact that you have consistently written stories that were unfavorable to my person, my government and to the Cuban people.[39]

Batista officials also counter-attacked in another way against what they considered to be a concerted effort by Matthews to bring down the Cuban regime. On June 18, 1957, Cuba made an official protest to the Council of the Organization of American States (OAS) regarding statements Matthews had made on a CBS panel interview the previous Sunday. As the newsman reported to his boss, Emmanuel Freedman, foreign editor of the *Times*, "The protest was referred to a meeting of the entire 13-member General Committee of the OAS last evening where the sentiment against Cuba was so overwhelming that the Cuban Ambassador, in order to avoid a humiliating defeat, was permitted to withdraw his complaint."[40]

On August 11, 1957, Matthews published an article, "The Shadow Falls on Cuba's Batista," in *The New York Times Magazine*. By now the journalist was stepping up the timetable for the collapse of the Batista regime. The second paragraph of this article stated:

. . . the long reign of Fulgencio Batista is coming to an end. The writing on the Cuban wall, however cryptic as to the exact time and manner of departure, is clear enough. Even granting his own wish to finish out this term of office, Batista would retire on Feb. 1, 1959, a year and a half from now. Few Cubans today would give him that long a lease on power.[41]

The article, detailing brutality and corruption in Batista's regime of recent years, also presented the positive aspects of the man's long career. Castro was mentioned only in reference to the "well-trained, desperate, enthusiastic young rebels under Fidel Castro in the Sierra Maestra of Oriente Province." The article concluded:

> It took character, courage, political mastery, administrative ability and popular appeal [for Batista] to reach the heights and stay there for twenty-four years. But now there is a sense of implacable history closing in on Fulgencio Batista. He is a man at bay, fighting a rearguard action, bravely and effectively. But for how long?[42]

As in the closing paragraph of the original series of three articles, this statement could be considered a call for action by Batista's opponents to close in for the kill: he was wounded and limping badly. At any rate, Batista's opponents made the most of Matthews' article. René Zayas Bazán of the Cuban underground movement mailed Matthews a mimeographed copy of his article translated into Spanish and noted that "it is being passed from hand to hand among the [Cuban] population."[43]

The *Times'* coverage of Castro's guerrilla warfare began to diverge between conflicting reports by Mrs. Phillips, resident correspondent in Havana, and Matthews, who had his own news sources whose letters were smuggled out of Cuba.[44] The break between the latter and Mrs. Phillips began to appear behind the scenes when Matthews complained in a memorandum to Freedman, foreign editor of the *Times*, on June 19, 1957, "Incidentally, about four weeks ago Ruby had the Govt launching the most terrific en[d]-all, mop-up campaign against Fidel ever. Now what? From my information Fidel is going just as strong as ever. Shouldn't we have a follow up?"[45]

Indeed, in many instances Matthews had better long-distance news sources than Mrs. Phillips had on the scene. For example, he received a five-page, single-spaced letter from Juan Marinello, leader of the PSP, the Cuban Communist party, who explained on March 17, 1957:

> . . . we consider that this [July 26] Group encourages noble aims but, in general, proceeds with wrong tactics. Therefore we do not agree with its actions, but we call upon all the parties and popular sectors to defend it against the blows of the tyranny, not forgetting that those who make up that Movement are fighting a government abhorred by all the Cuban people.[46]

Raúl Chibás, a Castro supporter who had been president of the Ortodoxo party in the 1950s, kept Matthews informed of the *Movimiento de Resistencia Cívica*, which Chibás asserted in a letter of April 16, 1957, had spread from Oriente to the other five provinces.[47] Mario Llerena, who was to be in charge of Propaganda and Public Relations after Castro established a July 26 Committee in exile in the United States on October 30, 1957,[48] reported to Matthews from Havana on May 12, 1957: "I am confident about our ultimate victory. I feel sure about it. Fidel gains stature and prestige day by day. Our men have a solid and unbreakable morale."[49]

Some of the information Matthews received was fairly accurate and other reports grossly exaggerated. In the former category, Armando Hart, who was to become Minister of Education after Castro gained power, wrote on November 4, 1957, that the number of men and arms had increased five-fold in the eight months since Matthews' interview with Castro.[50] But in the latter category were such overblown statements as that of July 6, 1958, by Rufo López-Fresquet, who was to serve as Minister of the Treasury before fleeing Castro's Cuba, that "Rebel forces have grown to 20,000 in Oriente, close to 1,000 in Cubitas Hills, Camagüey, and over 2,000 in the Trinidad Mountains."[51]

Nevertheless, the momentum of the rebellion increased until Batista and others of his entourage fled to the Dominican Republic on January 1, 1959. They left behind a well equipped and well trained Army of some 40,000 men demoralized and defeated by the corruption and brutality of their own officers and by an original band of about a score of men who caught the imagination of an outraged populace. When Castro made his triumphal week-long tour the length of the island, from Santiago to Havana, Matthews was there to witness it with a rebel press pass with a notation typed in capital letters, *EDITORIALISTA ESPECIAL*. Turner Catledge, chief news executive for the *Times*, wrote from New York:

> You've done just what I predicted in my cable of congratulations of January 2—"Kept us ahead of the pack." We are grateful and through this note want you to know it. Many, many thanks. I know you and Nancy [sic] have enjoyed being in the thick of it. But take care of yourselves. Warmest regards.[52]

Castro was a hero throughout the United States, but the warm regards were not to last long. First to alienate the U.S. press were the summary trials and executions of *batistiano* "war criminals" in January, 1959. But, as Matthews noted later in an article for the British publication *Encounter*:

> Virtually all Cubans approved or accepted the executions as necessary, but for an American to express understanding and to make the point that the trials and executions, however contrary to the normal traditions of Anglo-Saxon legality, were rough justice and a sensible method of preventing mob violence and private vengeance was considered outrageous.[53]

By the time Castro made his visit to the United States in April 1959, as historian Hubert Herring has pointed out, "The American press had angered Fidel by its denunciation of his highhanded ways . . . [and in return it] was accused of being subsidized by pro-Batista elements."[54]

Matthews was alarmed at the reportage in the *Times* itself. He wrote to Arthur Hays Sulzberger, chairman of the board, on July 18, 1959, "Ruby Phillips has been very emotional and very hostile and she, too, despite her experience, is essentially an amateur."[55] Matthews asked for and obtained permission to go to Cuba himself for a week or ten days. Mrs. Phillips recalled later that after he arrived Matthews "was irritated because I did not exhibit any enthusiasm for the Castro revolution."[56] In his story, Matthews referred to Fidel as "the young man who single-handed has made the history of Cuba today." He added:

> Half a year after the revolt against the Batista regime, Cuba is in the midst of the first great social revolution in Latin America since the Mexican Revolution of 1910. This is not a Communist revolution in any sense of the word and there are no Communists in positions of control. . . . There seem to be very few [persons] in Cuba—and one need have no hesitation in saying this—who believe Fidel Castro is a Communist, is under Communist influence or is a dupe of communism. . . .[57]

Mrs. Phillips recalled later in her book, *The Cuban Dilemma* (1962), "It hardly seemed possible to me that the Cubans could be so blind and Herbert so stubborn in his refusal to see."[58]

Matthews was correct, however, at the time he was writing in mid-1959, with two exceptions. He overlooked the significance of the Bolivian National Revolution which got underway in 1952, and he did not realize that Raúl Castro and Che Guevara were

both Marxists of long standing, an error carried over into his book *The Cuban Story* (1961). Perhaps Matthews was so adamant on the point of communism in July, 1959, because on the previous day the *Times* had front-paged the testimony before a Senate subcommittee of Major Pedro Luis Díaz Lanz, former head of the Cuban Air Force who had fled Cuba on June 29. He charged, in the words of the reporter covering the story, that "Premier Fidel Castro was the chief Communist in Cuba and a member of the international Communist conspiracy."[59]

Time magazine took advantage of the divergent views of Matthews and Mrs. Phillips to attack the former in its edition of July 27, 1959, contrasting their coverage of the rapidly unfolding Cuban story. The article also lifted quotations out of context from Matthews' *The Education of a Correspondent* (1946) to castigate him for noting "the charm and hospitality of the Japanese" in 1929, and for supporting Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia in 1935. His coverage of the Republicans during the Spanish Civil War also came under attack, and the piece concluded that in Cuba, Matthews "is viewed more as a revolutionary institution than a working newsman."[60]

William Attwood, foreign editor of *Look*, fired off a letter to John Koffend, editor of the Press section of *Time*:

> [I want you to] know how shocked I was to read the piece about Herbert Matthews. I have seen many examples of non-journalism in TIME over the years, but this is the first one I've noticed in which a newspaperman is singled out by a publication for professional demolition. You don't have to agree with Matthews' views to be dismayed by such editorial arrogance—especially in a magazine that makes a point of deploring McCarthyism.[61]

Matthews ignored such personal attacks, but he was profoundly alarmed and concerned about what most of the U.S. press was doing, consciously or unconsciously, in its coverage of the Cuban Revolution. He fought valiantly to keep the Communist label from being slapped on Fidel, believing this attitude was pushing the Cuban leader into a corner. As Matthews wrote to Philip W. Bonsal, U.S. ambassador to Cuba, on July 27, 1959:

> I feel most of all that the attacks on Cuba and on Fidel Castro and his associates for being Communist or pro-Communist, are achieving exactly the opposite effect from what we all want. Senators Eastland, Keating, Dodd and company, are God's gift to the Cuban Communists. So are *Time* and *Life*

magazines and many other columnists and commentators who so stupidly attack the Castro regime without a proper basis for such attacks. In so doing they make it just about impossible for Fidel to take an openly anti-Communist line.[62]

By early 1960, Matthews was coming under attack from many quarters. When the *Saturday Evening Post* ran an editorial calling Castro a "crackpot surrounded by Communist operators," the Rev. Ira E. Sherman of a Methodist church in Matanzas province sent the editor a copy of a paper presented by Matthews at Stanford University. Frederick Nelson, senior editor of the *Post*, replied, "Herbert Matthews of the New York Times seems to have been the father of the Castro movement, as he was of the abortive movement in Spain twenty-odd years ago." In sending a copy of the reply to Matthews, the Rev. Sherman commented, "I thought you would be surprised to learn that you are considered to be the father of the Spanish Republic."[63]

But it was within the *Times* itself that Matthews was to be tested most severely. James Reston, head of the *Times* Washington bureau, wrote a news analysis on Cuba, which appeared on February 19, 1960, and which began, "Cuba's drift to the Left is causing more concern here than any event in the hemisphere since the Communist threat to Guatemala in 1954." Reston was disturbed by the visit to Cuba of Anastas I. Mikoyan, one of the two First Deputy Premiers of the Soviet Union, and asked, "What, for example, if the Soviet Union negotiated a mutual security pact with Cuba . . . ? Could Washington tolerate such a move? Could it prevent such a move without landing the Marines in Cuba?"[64]

On the same day that Reston's column appeared, Matthews wrote an earnest letter to his friend:

You write as if it were possible for Cuba to be another Guatemala and for the situation to be handled quite simply as in the past by sending Marines. . . . Another feature of this situation that I think should be called to your attention is that Guatemala became so dangerous more than anything because of our inept and very misguided diplomacy. . . . If certain pressures force us into taking strong measures against Cuba I think that almost anything can happen, and whatever it is would be very bad for the United States as well as Cuba and Latin America.[65]

Reston replied: "So long as this remains merely as a revolutionary situation nobody with even the vaguest knowledge of that country [Cuba] in the past can be anything but sympathetic. But

once there is a drift toward conspiracy linked to Moscow then it is a whole new ball game."[66]

The upshot of this exchange was that Reston went to Cuba himself and wrote a couple of stories which agreed with Mrs. Phillips, much to her delight, that Cuba indeed was moving toward a Communist form of government.[67] In the infighting at the *Times*, Matthews had lost and his ordeal was about to begin.

Between August, 1960, and August, 1964, he faced attack from the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Matthews recalled in his memoir, "At each of the ten or more hearings my name and supposed misdemeanors figured more or less prominently." Nevertheless, he was not called as a witness and given the chance to defend himself. More seriously, the hearings wrecked the careers of Roy R. Rubottom, Jr., the Assistant Secretary of State, and William A. Wieland, head of the Caribbean desk of the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs.[68]

It was ironic to link Matthews with these two men, because he differed with them on Department of State policy, and on at least one occasion he tried to act directly as intermediary between the United States and Cuba. On July 21, 1960, Matthews had lunch with Raúl Roa, Cuban foreign minister, and other Cuban officials at the United Nations. Then the newspaperman wrote Rubottom, "They wanted me to note the fact that although they are accused of being a satellite of the Soviet Union Roa carefully abstained from seeing any of the Russians at any time" during his visit to New York. Matthews added:

> **Their insistence all along was on their acknowledged dependence on the Soviet bloc economically but that they had no commitment of any sort politically. The visit of Raúl Castro to Moscow, I gather, was simply a defiant gesture toward the United States. They insisted that he had no intention on this trip of negotiating for arms.**

Matthews concluded that it was not his custom to pass along to third parties information that he received personally and confidentially, but that he was doing so in this instance because he had the "decided impression" that Roa and the others wanted him to do so.[69]

Although Matthews received a long, official reply from Rubottom, the State Department official expressed himself more frankly in a handwritten note:

> In all honesty, I doubt that Roa could negotiate with the U.S. even if he wanted to, which is open to doubt. They had countless opportunities before positions got where they are today, but never seized a one.[70]

Matthews answered, "I feel that we have not left Fidel Castro any real opening if or when the time comes that he would like to try to reach an understanding with us."[71]

By late 1960 and early 1961, Matthews was receiving a flood of hate mail, and the pickets outside the *Times* building by then were hostile. He wrote Arthur Hays Sulzberger on February 2, 1961, only two months before the Bay of Pigs invasion:

> These letters about Cuba prove to me once again what I have been arguing all along—that a dangerous emotionalism has developed in the United States over the situation. It is dangerous because it affects Congress and that in turn brings pressure on the State Department.[72]

Matthews found himself increasingly isolated on the *Times* staff itself. For example, Francis Brown, editor of the *New York Times Book Review*, refused to use Matthews' review of C. Wright Mills' *Listen Yankee—The Revolution in Cuba* (1960). The *Times* correspondent Tad Szulc did the review, even though he was not in Cuba when Mills, a professor of sociology at Columbia University, made his observations, whereas Matthews was. His rejected review began:

> The academic world has been waking up to the true significance of the Cuban revolution before our mass communications media. This was perhaps to be expected because there is a goodly number of Latin Americanists in our universities and very few in journalism.[73]

The pressure was on Matthews from the management of the *Times* as well. As he described the showdown in his memoir:

> The atmosphere was getting so hot for *The Times* that late in the summer of 1961, Orvil Dryfoos, then president and publisher, called me to his office. He was cordial and pleasant, but also upset and worried. The gist of what he said was that somehow a truce must be called in the battle between me and my critics, as it was proving too embarrassing to *The Times*. . . . The main result of our talk was that I did not try to visit Cuba again for two and a half years, thereby losing touch—which was bad for *The Times* as well as for me, and I also cut down on my lecturing.[74]

For solace, Matthews wrote to his friend and fellow war correspondent Ernest Hemingway, stating simply, "I feel more than ever a need for moral support." Matthews mentioned the book by

the ex-Marxist Nathaniel Weyl, *Red Star Over Cuba* (1961), and commented sardonically, "It should have been called 'Red Star Over Times Square' since it is mostly about me." Matthews explained in his letter to Hemingway:

> I try to keep out of all controversies on Cuba and never answer attacks. The only reason I called [Ambassador Arthur] Gardner a perjurer was that he tried to besmirch a reputation I have spent nearly 40 years in building of never faking stories and also because it seemed important to keep the historic record straight.[75]

Later, Matthews was to date the beginning of the rapprochement between Castro and the Cuban Communists as about mid-1960.[76] On May 25 of that year Matthews received a letter from his trusted friend Helen López-Fresquet in Cuba, who informed him, "I can't rationalize any longer. This country is being run completely by the communists, and it looks more and more as though that is just the way Fidel planned it and wants to continue it."[77] Matthews did not agree on the last point because he believed that Castro had been sincere and honest in whatever he said at any given moment in a rapidly unfolding social revolution. As Matthews had written to Carlos Todd of the *Times of Havana* on March 16, 1959, "I find it impossible to believe that anyone who has felt the way he [Castro] did and fought as he fought for seven years, can change overnight."[78]

No one has proved otherwise. Yet as Matthews recalled later, "for forty-eight hours after Fidel made his famous 'I am a Marxist-Leninist' speech on December 1-2, 1961, I went through the worst period of my career."[79] The UPI reported that Fidel had declared in the speech that he had been a Communist since his student days. But when the full official text became available, it was clear, as Matthews put it, that "he was apologizing for *not* having been one and for being so slow in appreciating the virtues of Marxism."[80]

In conclusion, did Fidel Castro get his job through the New York *Times*, as a caricature in the *National Review* depicted him as saying?[81] The overwhelming weight of evidence indicates that such an exaggeration was amusing but unjustified. On the face of it, it is witless to suggest that Matthews or the New York *Times* invented or created Fidel Castro. This, as the *Hispanic American Report* once said, "is as absurd as blaming a meteorologist for a

thunderstorm."[82] Or as Matthews himself expressed it in his 1969 biography of Castro, "No amount of sensational publicity would have meant anything in the course of a short time if Fidel Castro had not been just as I described him."[83] Both the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the public at large sought to place blame for "losing" Cuba to communism, and Matthews was a prime target. The Senate body declared that Matthews had made Castro "a Robin Hood of the Sierra Maestra," and even the distinguished British historian Hugh Thomas wrote that Matthews and later the CBS documentary team "created . . . a hero, a legend, a T.E. Lawrence of the Caribbean."[84]

Such exaggerations should not obscure the fact that the Matthews interview did have considerable impact throughout the hemisphere. Some observers believed it gave Castro a decisive boost on his road to power. Edward W. Scott, the NBC representative in Havana, for example, wrote to Matthews in 1961, "I have said in the press and I reiterate that I think your trip to the Sierra to interview Fidel saved the Castro revolution from utter defeat and paved the way for its success."[85] And José M. Bosch, president of the Bacardí Company and one who opposed both Batista and Castro, also wrote to Matthews in 1961, "To Fidel you are the equivalent of an army division, so winning you away will be quite a victory!"[86]

As for the conflict within the *Times* itself, Matthews has made it clear that it was for him a family quarrel or argument. As he wrote in a letter of January 20, 1976, the *Times* "had to absorb a great deal of criticism for my work, and let it run longer than any other paper would have, since they trusted my ability and integrity."[87] Nevertheless, Matthews was returned to his editorial-writing position, and the *Times* did not use news articles offered by him after trips to Cuba in 1963 and 1966. On the latter occasion, he was gathering material for his biography of Castro, and after his retirement in 1967 he went to the island one more time in 1972 to collect data for his book *Revolution in Cuba, An Essay in Understanding* (1975). Thus, on two occasions the *Times* missed the opportunity to present to its readers unique views of what was happening inside revolutionary Cuba. Turner Catledge, then chief news executive of the *Times*, presented his side of the story in his memoir published in 1971:

> On at least two occasions we declined to publish articles by Matthews on Cuba. . . . To put it simply, I felt that Matthews, despite certain obvious changes in judgment, had lost his credibility as a reporter on Castro, and that to print his articles would do the *Times* more harm than good. I reached the decision with reluctance, but I thought it was necessary to protect the *Times'* credibility.[88]

Catledge said the *Times* had worked hard to earn its high reputation "for responsible reporting and reasoned editorializing."[89]

Part of Matthews' difficulty may have been that much of the U.S. press—and therefore the U.S. public—was poorly educated in Latin American affairs. Matthews wrote in 1976:

> The problem is one of *sustained* interest. When there is a revolution or assassination, of course, some news is printed. I decided that it was a vicious circle: readers are generally interested in what is familiar to them; since they are *not* interested in Latin America, editors will not provide money, personnel or space to educate them.[90]

Matthews also felt that readers were predisposed to believe the most unfavorable reports about Latin America. His analysis of why most of the U.S. press had bungled the Cuban story:

> Readers or radio and television listeners believed (in fact, wanted to believe) the worst about Cuba long before it became as bad as they thought. The result of this type of approach was to bring about, or to hasten, this "worst," and that is what can happen whenever a leftist revolutionary situation develops or threatens in Latin America or anywhere else in the world.

In other words, he continued, "The American mass media . . . tend to create a fantastic world. The picture they draw is a response to a predisposed public opinion which is both satisfied and moulded by it."[91]

Finally, in the history of American journalism Matthews should rank alongside Lincoln Steffens and John Reed as liberal interpreters of foreign social revolutions. Steffens, who made his name as a muckraker, reported the campaigns of the successful Venustiano Carranza faction after the Mexican Revolution began in 1910. Reed rode with the forces of Pancho Villa and later summed up his observations of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia with his classic of modern journalism, *Ten Days That Shook the World.* But Matthews was a more controlled writer than either of his predecessors. A sensitive observer rigorously devoted to his craft, Matthews did not find it necessary to sacrifice objectivity to produce his informed and interpretative reporting. Moral courage

in reporting the truth as one sees it is not to be condemned, and coverage of the Cuban Revolution by Matthews will stand the test of time. He reported a Cuban response to a Cuban crisis during the Cold War, and for telling the truth as he saw it he was vilified: the messenger was confused with the message. As Eduardo Santos, publisher of *El Tiempo* of Bogotá and former president of Colombia (1938-1942), wrote to Matthews in 1960 about his coverage of the Cuban Revolution:

> There are seductive aspects which you point out beautifully. There are others less attractive and some detestable. But as you say one is dealing with a *Revolution*, and Revolutions never have been pretty, nor peaceful, nor totally prudent and just. But they are almost always—alas!—necessary.[92]

NOTES

1. For clarification of factual points raised throughout this paper, the author is indebted to the late Herbert L. Matthews for replying in two letters to questions put to him. The letters, from Glenelg, Australia, are dated Jan. 2 and Jan. 20, 1976.

2. The most comprehensive accounts of the Cuban Revolution to date are Hugh Thomas, *Cuba or The Pursuit of Freedom* (London, 1971) and Herbert L. Matthews, *Revolution in Cuba, An Essay in Understanding* (New York, 1975).

3. In addition to the book cited above, see Herbert L. Matthews, *The Cuban Story* (New York, 1961) and *Fidel Castro* (New York, 1969). See also Matthews, "Cuba in Ferment," *Foreign Policy Bulletin* (April 1, 1957), 109-112; "The Lessons of Latin America," *ibid.* (June 15, 1958), 145-6 and 152; "The United States and Latin America," *International Affairs* (January 1961), 9-18; ed., *The United States and Latin America*, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963), 1-7 and 121-75; *Return to Cuba* (Stanford, 1964); "Dissent Over Cuba," *Encounter* (July 1964), 82-90, and "Fidel Castro Revisited," *War/Peace Report* (December 1967), 3-5.

4. In 1943 he wrote, "I, too, was an enthusiastic admirer of Fascism once, but I saw in the travail of Spain, under Italian bombs that brought misery and death to a brave and unoffending people, what Fascism meant to me and all of us." Herbert L. Matthews, *The Fruits of Fascism* (New York, 1943), iv.

5. This is the feeling evidenced in Herbert L. Matthews, *A World in Revolution, A Newspaperman's Memoir* (New York, 1971) in Chap. 9, "Cuba and *The Times*," 337-65.

6. Herbert L. Matthews to Dryfoos, Markel and Catledge, March 31, 1961, in Herbert L. Matthews Papers, hereafter cited as HLM Papers, Butler Library, Columbia University, New York.

7. In the introduction to this panoramic view of the Cuban Revolution, Matthews states, "For sixteen years Americans have been fed a copious but almost universally hostile flow of information on Cuba, although the flow has dwindled to a trickle in recent years." *Revolution in Cuba*, 2. Castro closed down the Associated Press and United Press International bureaus in Havana in 1968. *Ibid.*, 2-3.

8. Matthews, *The Education of a Correspondent* (New York, 1946), 11. Emphasis added.

9. Matthews, *The Yoke and the Arrows, A Report on Spain* (New York, 1961), 225.

10. Tad Szulc, *Twilight of the Tyrants* (New York, 1959).

11. R. Hart Phillips, *Cuba, Island of Paradox* (New York, 1959), 290. United Press and International News Service were merged into UPI in 1958.

12. Matthews, *The Cuban Story*, 18-44. The complete text of the story which appeared on Feb. 24, 1957, is given, *ibid.*, 27-39, and abridged versions

of all three installments may be found in Matthews, *A World in Revolution*, Appendix, 439-45.

13. *Ibid.*, 300-303.

14. She was married to James Doyle Phillips, who became the *Times'* resident Cuban correspondent in 1931 after they had lived in Havana several years. Together they covered the increasing brutality and terrorism of the last two years of the Gerardo Machado dictatorship (1924-1933) and the rise of Sergeant Fulgencio Batista. After the death of Mr. Phillips in an automobile accident in California in 1937, she carried on alone. Phillips, *Cuba, Island of Paradox*, 3-184.

15. Javier Pazos to Matthews, Jan. 6, 1961. HLM Papers. This judgment of the Cuban press under Batista has been substantiated by Marvin Alisky, "Havana Havoc: Too Many Dailies, Subsidies Corrupt Crowded Cuban Journalism," *Nieman Reports* (April 1956), 16-18, and "Cuban Press: Censorship Replaces Bribery," *ibid.* (April 1957), 17-18.

16. Felipe Pazos to Matthews, June 10, 1960. HLM Papers. Both of the Pazos, father and son, fled Castro's Cuba.

17. Ruby Phillips to Matthews, March 5, 1961. HLM Papers.

18. Scott to Matthews, March 17, 1961. HLM Papers. In the conclusion to his four-page, single-spaced letter, Scott declared: "To the best of my knowledge and belief, Ambassador Gardner did not know anything about your trip to the Sierra until your interview with Fidel appeared in the New York Times. As I say, Gardner is a friend of mine, and I would not like gratuitously to harm him."

19. Javier Pazos to Matthews, Jan. 6, 1961. HLM Papers.

20. The three-column headline under the name plate on the front page of the *Times* for Feb. 24, 1957, read, "Cuban Rebel Is Visited in Hideout," with the subhead, "Castro Is Still Alive and Still Fighting in Mountains." There was a two-column picture of Fidel holding his telescopic rifle, printed over his signature and "Sierra Maestra, Febrero 17 de 1957," in his handwriting.

21. Matthews, *The Cuban Story*, 41. This was the first and last time that Castro publicly ridiculed Matthews. Later, the Cuban Premier lauded him as a newspaperman with liberal ideas who was sensitive to the Revolution. New York *Times*, Nov. 1, 1963.

22. *Ibid.*, Feb. 25, 1957. The second installment got a two-column headline, "Rebel Strength Gaining in Cuba, But Batista Has the Upper Hand," in the lower right corner of the front page.

23. *Ibid.*, Feb. 24, 1957.

24. *Ibid.*, Feb. 26, 1957. The last article in the three-part series ran on page 13, with a two-column headline, "Old Order in Cuba Is Threatened by Forces of an Internal Revolt," and sub-headed, "Traditionally Corrupt System Faces Its First Major Test as Reform Groups Challenge Batista Dictatorship." Two of the three Cubans who accompanied the Matthews from Havana to Manzanillo—Faustino Pérez and Lilliam Mesa—were detained by Batista's *Servicio de Inteligencia Militar* on March 19, 1957. Dr. Pérez was tortured and Srta. Mesa was terrorized, taken gagged and handcuffed twice through

the *Bosque de la Habana* in the early dawn. She was threatened unless she confessed to her participation in the trip. Dolores Montero to Matthews, March 24, 1957. HLM Papers.

25. As Matthews recalled in *The Cuban Story* (p. 40), "I could not claim, myself, at the time to have had any idea of the terrific impact my story was going to have, or the chain reaction it was going to set up in the whole Western Hemisphere."

26. William M. Porter, an attorney who represented the Batista exiles, to Matthews, Feb. 27, 1957. HLM Papers.

27. Robert Taber, *M-26, Biography of a Revolution* (New York, 1961), 98.

28. Raoul Alfonso Gonsé to Matthews, Feb. 25, 1957. HLM Papers.

29. Richard G. Cushing to Matthews, Feb. 26, 1957. HLM Papers. Cushing, who congratulated Matthews "for a piece of journalism reminiscent of the beats of a bygone age," added, "My only criticism is that your pieces would be better documented if you appeared together with FC in a photo."

30. Cushing to Edward Scott, Feb. 27, 1957. Ellipses are in the original.

31. Matthews, *The Cuban Story*, 45-8. General Martín Díaz Tamayo, military commander of Oriente Province, also issued a denial on Feb. 29, 1957. *Ibid.*, 48. Glossy 8 x 10 photographs, both original and retouched, are included in the HLM Papers.

32. Matthews to Turner Catledge, March 4, 1957. HLM Papers.

33. Edward Scott to Matthews, Feb. 28, 1957. HLM Papers.

34. Edward W. Barrett to Matthews, March 6, 1957. HLM Papers. Matthews also received a highly complimentary letter from Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, March 1, 1957. HLM Papers.

35. Gainza Paz to Matthews, March 9, 1957. HLM Papers.

36. Brogan to Matthews, Feb. 28, 1957. HLM Papers.

37. Salisbury to Matthews, May 1, 1957. HLM Papers.

38. Taber, *M-26*, 11 and 114. The statement by *Bohemia* is quoted on page 114. See also the report to CBS news directors of April 1, 1957, substantiating Matthews' analysis of the Cuban situation, *ibid.*, 135-7.

39. Matthews submitted seven questions, beginning with, "There is widespread civic unrest in Cuba. What do you think are its causes and what are its solutions?" The questions and answers comprise eight typewritten pages. HLM Papers.

40. Matthews to Manny [Freedman], June 19, 1957. HLM Papers.

41. *New York Times Magazine* (Aug. 11, 1957), 14. The lead-in to the article read, "After a quarter-century of dominance, the dictator is fighting the hardest battle of a remarkable career. A correspondent suggests it is probably his last."

42. *Ibid.*, 43.

43. René Zayas Bazán to Matthews, Sept. 7, 1957. HLM Papers.

44. See, for example, Juan Marinello to Matthews, March 17, 1957. HLM Papers. Another news source was Pedro E. Saumell, the Manzanillo school teacher at whose home Nancie Matthews stayed during the interview of Feb.

17, 1957. See Pedro E. Saumell, who had just fled to Miami, to Matthews, Dec. 1958. HLM Papers.

45. Matthews to Manny [Freedman], June 19, 1957. HLM Papers.

46. Marinello to Matthews, March 17, 1957. HLM Papers.

47. Chibás to Matthews, April 16, 1957. HLM Papers. Chibás pointed out that the right of "civic resistance" was guaranteed by the Cuban Constitution of 1940.

48. Fidel Castro to Mario Llerena, Oct. 30, 1957. HLM Papers. Llerena resigned his post on July 16, 1958. Llerena's press release, Aug. 13, 1958. HLM Papers.

49. Llerena to Matthews, May 12, 1957. HLM Papers.

50. A. Hart to Matthews, Nov. 4, 1957. HLM Papers. Llerena smuggled the letter out when he went into exile.

51. Rufo [López-Fresquet] to Matthews, July 6, 1958. It was Richard G. Cushing of the USIS in Havana who gave Matthews the lead on López-Fresquet as a news source. Cushing to Matthews, Feb. 26, 1957. HLM Papers.

52. Turner Catledge to Matthews, Jan. 13, 1959. HLM Papers. Matthews gave to the Smithsonian Institution some memorabilia, including the "Sierra Maestra" medal which Castro awarded to Matthews and other newsmen at the Cuban Embassy in Washington, D.C., in April, 1959.

53. Matthews, "Dissent Over Cuba," *Encounter*, 83. An anonymous letter to the editors of the *Times* from "An officer in the Cuban Army," Sept. 15, 1958, placed the death toll for Batista's earlier counter-terrorism at 15,000. HLM Papers.

54. *A History of Latin America from the Beginnings to the Present* (New York, 1968), 409.

55. Matthews to Arthur [Hays Sulzberger], June 18, 1959. HLM Papers.

56. R. Hart Phillips, *The Cuban Dilemma* (New York, 1962), 98.

57. New York *Times*, July 16, 1959.

58. P. 100.

59. New York *Times*, July 15, 1959. The story was written by Allen Drury.

60. *Time* (July 27, 1959), 47-8.

61. William Attwood to John Koffend, July 29, 1959. HLM Papers. Koffend replied on July 30 that he had been on vacation, and did not deny *Time*'s arrogance. He invited Attwood to have lunch with him to discuss the matter, and concluded, "Anyway, the deed, whatever it was, was done. Since I am a coward, I do not intend to take sides on it." HLM Papers.

62. Matthews to Bonsal, July 27, 1959. HLM Papers. Matthews tried to keep the historical record straight. For example, he informed *Life* that a picture of a Cuban woman "about to die" which it published was false since she was not executed. Matthews to Andrew Heiskell, publisher of *Life*, Feb. 3, 1959, and Matthews to William Gray, editor of *Life en Español*, Feb. 3, 1959. HLM Papers. Matthews wrote to Heiskell, "This, like almost all the photographs that have been published, is intended to show the ferocity of the rebel victors."

63. Nelson to the Rev. Sherman, Jan. 25, 1960, and Sherman to Matthews, Feb. 13, 1960. HLM Papers.

64. New York *Times*, Feb. 19, 1960.

65. Matthews to Scotty [Reston], Feb. 19, 1960. HLM Papers.

66. Reston's reply to Matthews is not dated. HLM Papers.

67. Phillips, *The Cuban Dilemma*, 156. Also, telephone interview with Mrs. Phillips, Jan. 20, 1976. Mrs. Phillips left Cuba in June, 1961, and quit the New York *Times* at the end of October, 1963. She worked for *Newsday* until the end of 1968.

68. Matthews, *A World in Revolution*, 297-317. The quotation is from page 297.

69. Matthews to Dick [Rubottom], July 21, 1960. HLM Papers.

70. Rubottom to Matthews, Aug. 15, 1960. The handwritten note is undated. HLM Papers.

71. Matthews to Rubottom, Aug. 19, 1960. HLM Papers.

72. Matthews to Sulzberger, Feb. 2, 1961. HLM Papers.

73. Francis Brown to Matthews, Nov. 7, 1960, and Matthews to Francis Brown, Nov. 11, 1960. A typescript copy of Matthews' review, along with these letters, is in the HLM Papers.

74. Matthews, *A World in Revolution*, 343-4.

75. Matthews to Hemingway, Feb. 20, 1961. HLM Papers. Matthews also wrote, "I am trying to trace who put up the money for that book which is being very widely circulated." Actually, Matthews was mentioned only on pages 151-5 and 181 in Nathaniel Weyl, *Red Star Over Cuba, The Russian Assault on the Western Hemisphere* (New York, 1961). See also Matthews to Hemingway, March 15, 1961. HLM Papers.

76. Matthews, "Dissent Over Cuba," *Encounter*, 86.

77. Helen López-Fresquet to Matthews, May 25, 1960. HLM Papers.

78. Matthews to Todd, March 16, 1959. HLM Papers.

79. Matthews, *A World in Revolution*, 317.

80. *Ibid.*, 318.

81. *National Review*, May 7, 1960.

82. Quoted in Matthews, "Dissent Over Cuba," *Encounter*, 87.

83. Matthews, *Fidel Castro*, 110.

84. Thomas, *Cuba*, 946. Actually, it was Jules Dubois of the Chicago *Tribune* who referred to Castro as the Robin Hood of the Sierra Maestra.

85. Edward Scott to Matthews, March 17, 1961. HLM Papers.

86. Bosch to Matthews, March 15, 1961. HLM Papers.

87. Matthews to the author, Jan. 20, 1976.

88. Turner Catledge, *My Life and the Times* (New York, 1971), 267-8.

89. *Loc. cit.* Catledge concluded (p. 268), "It was not an easy decision, or one I was fully satisfied with; in retrospect I have the haunting thought that Matthews was more sinned against than sinning."

90. Matthews to the author, Jan. 2, 1976. Original emphasis.

91. Matthews, "Dissent Over Cuba," *Encounter*, 84.

92. Eduardo Santos to Matthews, Jan. 14, 1960. HLM Papers.